DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 571 CG 021 582

AUTHOR Burgio, Maria R.; Tryanski, Mandy
TITLE Comparing the Social Support Systems and Friendship Expectancies of Young Adults and Older Adults.
SPONS AGENCY Syracuse Univ., Utica, NY. Utica Coll.
PUB DATE Nov 88
GRANT 151-6014-6-047
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Gerontological Society (41st, San Francisco, CA, November 18-22, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Development; *Age Differences; Comparative Analysis; *Family Role; *Friendship; Higher Education; *Life Satisfaction; Older Adults; Peer Relationship; Social Networks; *Social Support Groups; Undergraduate Students; Well Being; Young Adults

ABSTRACT

Some research suggests that sources of social support change through the lifespan. Given that the support network changes because of both the individual's needs and the particular life stage of the individual, peer relationships may emerge as crucial sources of emotional support at different times in the lifespan. This study examined friend and family relationships of 142 older adults and 38 young adult college students who completed a self-report questionnaire measuring friendship expectancies, demographic backgrounds, health status, global life satisfaction, and interpersonal affect. Subjects also completed the Network Analysis Profile which measured the quantitative and qualitative aspects of both family and friend relationships. The results revealed that young and older adults were not similar in the support they acquired from close kin and close friends; older adults' support friends influenced positive affective states but not life satisfaction while young adults' support friends were just as important as support family for life satisfaction with neither relationship influencing affect. Young and older adults were not similarly affected by interacting within their entire friendship network. Finally, older and younger adults differed in how their cognitive assessments mediated interaction outcomes. These findings suggest that psychological well-being is multidimensional through the lifespan and that achieving well-being may be contingent upon receiving specific support which assists in dealing with the particular life stage tasks. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305571

Comparing the Social Support Systems and Friendship Expectancies of Young Adults and Older Adults

Maria R. Burgio, Ph.D.
and
Mandy Tryanski

Utica College of Syracuse University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maria R. Burgio

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 021582

Paper presented at the Forty-first Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological Society of America, San Francisco, Calif., November 18-22, 1988. We want to extend out thanks to Pam Cardinal who helped in data collection. This research was supported in part by a grant from Utica College of Syracuse University, Faculty Fellowships and Grants, No. 151-6014-6-047

Comparing the social support systems and friendship expectancies of young adults and older adults.

INTRODUCTION:

Social support systems are known to affect the psychological wellbeing of individuals of all ages. A social support system can be conceived as a subset of a social network, and is defined as system of individuals who provide the recipient with goods and services (Antonucci & Depner, 1982) or with help towards achieving her/his goal (Cobb, 1976; Caplan, 1974). Social support can mobilize psychological resources, deal with emotional problems, and provide the individual with practical help like money, advice, medical assistance and appropriate feedback (Cobb, 1976; Caplan, 1974). The presence of support relationships has been found to function as a buffer against the detrimental effects of various life transitions (Arling, 1976; Depner & Ingersoll, 1981; Cohen & McKay, 1984; Hammer, Gutwirth & Phillips, 1982); mediate coping responses (Cohen & McKay, 1984), enhance the life satisfaction and morale of the elderly (Arling, 1976), to affect health (Murphy, 1982), and to affect mental health (Beigel et al., 1984; Hammer, 1981; Murphy, 1982). Clearly, social support has been shown to have pervasive effects on people's lives, and it is the assumption of this study that the presence of social support is at the crux of psychological wellbeing.

Some research suggests that sources of social support change through the lifespan, questioning the relative importance of

friends and family members to wellbeing (Larson, 1984; Arling, 1976; Dickens & Perlman, 1981; Tesch, 1983; Cohan & Antonucci, 1987; Cantor, 1980). One cross-sectional study found that different amounts of time are spent with family and friends through the lifespan (Larson, 1984) and that interaction with friends consists of different activities and results in different effects than does interaction with family (Larson, 1984; Larson, Mannell & Zusunek, 1986). For example, a college student is more apt to have a large network of friends while contact with family is minimized, whereas a married individual with young children may not have the time nor the opportunity for much social interaction with friends, and a newly married couple may need the support of family ties for marital adjustment. Therefore, not only can we conceptualize the support network as a dynamic system which changes because of the needs or expectations of the individuals but also that the composition of the social support network may change as a factor of life stage.

Given that the support network changes because of both the individual's needs and the particular life stage of individual, we may expect that peer relationships emerge as crucial sources of emotional support at different times in the lifespan. Peer relationships are generally characterized as non-obligatory relationships based on shared interests and mutual respect, offering opportunities for resolving life stage issues. This suggests that friends may be more important than family for dimensions of psychological wellbeing (Larson, 1984), and perhaps

that friends may assist in resolving developmental tasks characteristic of a given life stage.

Young adults and older adults may require the same beneficial effects of peer relationships for their own respective life stage. The young adult at college must develop independence, find an identity within some work role, and develop an intimate relationship (Erikson, 1978). Likewise, the older adult is grappling with the independence-dependence issue (Tamir, 1982), as well as making adjustments about identity because of the loss of several social roles including the work role (Rosow, 1967; 1976) and the gaining of other roles like grandparenting. Since friendship consists of same-sex, same-age peers voluntarily established and maintained on the basis of mutual interests as well as mutual respect (Hess, 1972; 1979), friend relationships offer a testing ground for emerging identities and offer opportunities for enhancing a sense of self-competence and self-esteem needed for establishing one's independence (Rosow, 1967).

The young adult years and the later years may present developmental tasks which may profit by contacts with peers. Developmental tasks theory explains that a pattern of expectations for development appears as a result of biological changes and cultural influences (Havighurst, 1972; Erikson, 1968). Thus, individuals achieve different milestones at different age levels in society based on the social expectations for the age group. The tasks of young adults may include finalizing self identity, development of a capacity for intimacy,

and a commitment to a set of life goals that encompasses vocation and work role (Erikson, 1978; Buhler, 1968; Neugarten, 1966). In short, young adults are attempting to develop the hallmarks of maturity. Instead, later life tasks center on making adjustments to widowhood (and the death of other loved ones), to diminishing physical and sexual capabilities, and to changes in financial status (perhaps with a loss of the home of one's youth).

A Viable Mechanism of the Friend Support-Wellbeing Relationship.

Although the presence of support friends has been linked to psychological wellbeing of people of all ages, there is no clear understanding of the mechanism underlying the suppport-wellbeing relationship. One idea is that social support functions as a buffer against the more detrimental effects of various life transitions by mediating wellbeing (Cohen & McKay, 1984; Cobb; 1976). However, some researchers have noted that social support seems to be more effective in some circumstances than in others, making the buffering hypothesis insufficient in explaining why support works for one situation and not another. In response to this inadequacy, the role of cognitive assessments of relationships and the ways in which these assessments may affect interaction outcomes have begun to receive some attention (Burgio, 1987). This notion is not new to social psychologists who have expounded the importance of cognitive assessments of others to explain the effects of social interaction (Asch, 1943; Kelley, 1955, 1970; Jessor & Jessor, 1973; Jones, 1966),

suggesting the importance of factors intrinsic to the individual to explain interaction outcomes.

There is ample evidence that suggests the important role played by intrinsic factors to explain the scores on an array of psychological wellbeing indices. For example, some researchers of social support indicate that there is a relationship between subjective assessment of received support and the positive psychological effects which result (Beckman, 1981; Cohen & McKay, 1984; Reis, 1984). Similarly, it has been demonstrated that perceptions of relationships are related to the positive effects of interacting in these relationships (Tamir, 1982; Ward, Sherman & Lagory, 1984; Knapp & Williams, 1980). In one study by Linda George (1978), the data suggested that personality traits were better predictors of psychological wellbeing than were the social status measures or activity levels. In addition, one study on the social supports of older adults found that expectations of close friend behavior account for more of the variance in two different measures of psychological wellbeing than the actual number of support friends (Burgio, 1987). However, there is a gap in our understanding about which members of the social support system of young and older adults affect psychological wellbeing, whether the use of family or friends as sources of emotional support changes through the lifespan, and about the mechanism by which social support affects psychological wellbeing. As a result, some of the questions addressed in the present paper about social support systems concern:

-which members of the social support system are being utilized as sources of emotional support through the early adult and later adult years,

-are close friends more important than family relationships for people of different ages,

-can expectancies about close friends behavior account for the psychological wellbeing reported by young and older adults who have close friends.

It may be that friendships, and specifically, support friendships, are implicated as those relationships crucial to wellbeing of young and older adults, and perhaps that cognitive assessment of support friends mediates positive interaction with them. Therefore, the present researchers hypothesized that both young and older adults would report that

1) friend support relationships would be more important than family support relationships,

2) contact with all friends would be more highly related to life satisfaction than contact with all kin,

3) positive friendship expectancies of support friends may be more related to psychological wellbeing than the number of support friends.

METHOD

Sample.

A sample of older adults (N= 142) and young adults (N= 38) were compared in the present study. The data for the older

adults came from a larger study on the social support system and perceived expectations about support friends, collected in New York City in the summer of 1985. The older adult sample were 65 years or older with a mean age of 72.1, with 51% female and 49% male. Forty-four percent were married at the time of the interview, 30% were widowed, and 25% were either divorced, separated or never married. Religious affiliation for the older sample included 54% Catholic, 36% Jewish, 8% Protestant and 2% with no religious affiliation. This data was compared to data from a sample of young adults (N = 38), aged 17 to 23 years of age with a mean age of 18.9, with 32% male and 68% female and attending a central New York undergraduate college during the fall of 1987. All were single at the time of the interview. In addition, religious affiliation included 11% Catholic, 50% Protestant, 3% Jewish, andd 34% with no specific affiliation. (See Table 1 and 2 for the demographic information for the older adults and young adults, respectively).

Instruments and Procedure.

The testing for all subjects took place in two sessions. First, young and older subjects answered a self-report questionnaire which measured friendship expectancies, demographic backgrounds, health status, as well as global life satisfaction, and interpersonal affect. The Interpersonal Affect Questionnaire (Lehmann, Shinn, Allen & Simko, 1983) and Life Satisfaction Index-A (Adams, 1969) were the dependent measures in the study and measured psychological wellbeing as both the immediate,

affective sense of wellbeing as a result of interacting within the social network, and a global sense of satisfaction with life, respectively. The findings of numerous studies indicate that wellbeing in the aging and in the general population is multidimensional and thus justify the use of the two wellbeing measures (Lawton, Moss, Fulcomer & Kleban, 1982; Stock et al., 1986; Larson, Mannell & Zuzanek, 1986; Cutler, 1979; Andrews & Withey, 1976; Antonucci & Depner, 1980; Reis, 1984).

Friendship expectancies were measured with the Friendship Expectancies Inventory (FEI) and were defined as "the prescription of role expectancies which provide a basis for evaluation and interpretation of close friends behaviors (LaGaipa, 1980), and which were thought to be cognitive assessments of support friends which influence wellbeing.

The second part of the study took place by administering the Network Analysis Profile (NAP) which measured the quantitative and qualitative aspects of both family and friend relationships. The research participant was asked about the frequency and types of activities that characterized each relationship and then was asked to rate these people on the basis of closeness of friendship (best, good, friend, not a friend), importance of relationship, and presence of intimacy and understanding in the relationship. The inter-rater reliability of the NAP has been reported by Sokolovsky & Cohen (1981) as high, with the range of $\underline{r}$= .83 to $\underline{r}$= .92 on various subsections of the profile. Similar high inter-rater reliabilities were found in another study

(Burgio, 1987a).

Correlational analyses were performed on both data sets in order to ascertain whether any significant relationships existed between the numbers of friend and family support relationships and wellbeing, and between amount of contact and life satisfaction. Regression analyses and hierarchical regression analyses were used to determine the contribution made by friend versus kin contact, the contribution made by numbers of support friend and support kin relationships, and the contribution made by friendship expectancies to the dependent measures. For the older adult data, the demographic variables, namely, age, sex, marital status, and religious affiliation, coded as dichotomous variables, were entered first in the hierarchical regression analyses, in order to control for any variance contributed by them. The young adult sample was thought to be far more homogeneous in age, marital status and religious affiliation and not requiring this control. In any case, the sample size would have precluded the partialling out of any variance in the dependent variables. The methodological weaknesses will be covered in the Discussion section.

RESULTS

The results of the correlational and multiple regression analyses of the older adult data (N= 142) emphasized the importance of support friends for wellbeing and the importance of friendship expectancies of these support friends in mediating the

positive outcomes. Correlational analyses indicated that there was a positive relationship between the numbers of support friends and interpersonal affect ($r = .20$, $p < .02$) but no correlation between numbers of support friends and life satisfaction. Interestingly enough, correlational analyses indicated that seeing, writing and phoning kin was related to interpersonal affect ($r = .17$, $p < .05$) while similar contact with friends was not related to interpersonal affect ($r = .12$, n.s.) (See Table 3 and 4).

Regression analyses for the older adult data ($N = 142$) indicated that close support friends were more highly related to interpersonal affect than were relationships with close support kin (R Changes = .0350 and .0130, $z = 8.76$, p(two-tailed)$< .05$). However, having close support friends was not more highly related to life satisfaction than having close support kin (See Tables 5 and 6). In addition, a comparison of R changes indicated that contact with friends contributed more to the variance in life satisfaction than contact with kin ($z = 9.2$, p(two-tailed)$< .05$) (See Table 7). Lastly, regression analyses indicated that the presence of support relationships with friends did not contribute to life satisfaction ($F(1,135) = .1495$, n.s.) and to interpersonal affect ($F(1, 135) = 2.106$, n.s.) over and above the variability contributed by demographics and by expectancies. The data for both dependent measures indicated that the increments due to close friends was so small that expectancies account for most of the variance in both dependent measures. In other words,

friendship expectancies contribute more to the variance in life satisfaction ($F(5, 136) = 2.40$, $p < .05$) and interpersonal affect ($F(5, 136) = 5.99$, $p < .01$) than the presence of support relationship with friends (See Tables 8 and 9).

The results of the regression analyses of the older adults data confirmed the hypotheses that support friends are more important than support family for older adults's affective states, that contact with all friends was more important to life satisfaction than contact with all kin, and that friendship expectancies about friends were more highly related to life satisfaction and interpersonal affect than the mere presence of close friends. This data also indicated that friendship expectancies influence the wellbeing experienced by the aging who have close support friends, suggesting that friendship expectancies may be a better predictor of life satisfaction and interpersonal affect than the number of support friends within an elderly person's network. Therefore, this would mean that an older person's psychological wellbeing may be based more on his/her expectations about others than on availability of support relationships.

The same kinds of analyses were performed on the young adults data ($N = 38$) and resulted in some similar yet also different conclusions. The correlational analyses indicated that number of support friends was related to life satisfaction ($r = .35$, $p < .03$), and that number of support kin was related to life satisfaction ($r = .42$, $p < .009$). Neither support friend

(r=-.14) nor support kin (r= .17) were related to interpersonal affect. In addition, amount of visual, letter and phone contact with all friends (r= .01, n.s.) and all kin (r= .23, n.s.) were not related to life satisfaction (See Tables 10 and 11).

The relative importance of support friends versus support kin is also different for young and older adults. The multiple regression analyses of the young adult data indicated that support friends are not more important to life satisfaction than support kin (z= 1.50, n.s.), instead both support kin (F(1, 36)= 7.54, p< .03) and support friends (F(1, 36)= 5.04, p< .03) account for a statistically significant amount of the variance in life satisfaction (See Table 12). Unlike for older adults, affective states of young adults were not influenced by support friends nor by support kin. The R change for the analyses of the relation of close support friends to interpersonal affect and the relations of close support kin to interpersonal affect did not result in a statistically significant difference (See Table 13).

The comparison of the relative importance of friend versus kin contact yielded unexpected results. A comparison of the R changes indicated that amount of contact with all friends did not contribute more to the variance in life satisfaction than amount of contact with all kin, but rather that kin contact was significantly more important than friend contact (z = 16.75, p<.0001), even though kin contact was not significantly related to life satisfaction (F(1,36)= 2.04, p<.16) (See Table 14).

Lastly, regression analyses indicated that the presence of support relationships with friends did contribute to life satisfaction ($F(1, 35) = 4.67$, $p < .05$) over and above the variability contributed by friendship expectancies, indicating that expectancies do not mediate the positive outcome of interacting with close support friends among young adults (See Table 15). Contrary to this, close friends did not contribute to interpersonal affect over and above the variability contributed by friendship expectancies ($F(1,35) = 2.24$, n.s.). The data indicated that the increment due to friends was very small and that friendship expectancies account for most of the effect. This suggests that friendship expectancies of young adults mediate positive affective states. (See Table 16)

DICUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In comparing the results of the data for young and older adults, a number of interesting points can be made. First, young and older adults are not similar in the support they acquire from close kin and close friends. Whereas older adults' support friends influence positive affective states but not life satisfaction, young adults' support friends are just as important as support family for life satisfaction (but neither relationship influences affect).

The fact that both friend and family support relationships were equally as important to a sense of life satisfaction for the young adults indicated that young adults'

relationships with family may still be very important, perhaps due to their financial and emotional dependency, a dependency that is expected and nurtured by both the family and society. Although the young adult life stage is cited by many as a period when young people should have established a self separate from the parents (Offer & Offer, 1975), and should be a period in which individuals are developing a capacity for intimacy (Erikson, 1978), college students may need the emotional support of parents and other close family for psychological wellbeing. If we use Eriksonian logic, development has been arrested for the duration of the school years, and it would seem likely that the attainment of the developmental tasks characteristic of the young adult stage may also be slowed down, meaning that identity, autonomy, and intimacy may be put on hold until the time of first employment. Additionally, genuine emancipation from the family may not be possible without the period of experimentation when choices about occupation, marriage, religion, morality and friendship are considered (Arnstein, 1980). A potential ingredient making this period of choice even more complex is the mixture of backgrounds found among college students and the opportunity to talk with and relate to indivdiuals with different experiences, ideas and values. Nonetheless, relationships with close friends seem just as crucial to a global sense of life satisfaction for young adults, perhaps because support friends offer the opportunity for intimate exchange of plans for the future which may contribute to a positive overall assessment of

their lives.

It is interesting that affective states of the young are not positively influenced by social contacts as are affective states of older adults. In fact, affective states of young adults were not influenced by the presence of either support family or support friend relationships. This suggests that affective states of young adults may be linked to opposite-sex friends or to sexually intimate relationships rather than to same-sex friends. Erikson's theory of psychosocial development would predict that central to a young adult's life is the establishment of intimacy (Erikson, 1968), thus, support relationships with a same sex peer may not be as important as the "boyfriend" or "girlfriend" with whom a special closeness can be attained. Perhaps "feeling good" for the young college student may be linked to feelings of intimacy offered by opposite sex peers. An alternative explanation would be that same-sex support friends do not help in alleviating the negative affective states resulting from school pressure.

On the other hand, for older adults support friends were more important than support kin in influencing immediate affective states but not life satisfaction. The results suggest that for older adults, support friends can contribute to making an older individual "feel good". Friendships of later life have been found to impact an older person's sense of self-esteem and self-efficacy (Rosow, 1976). Perhaps the meaning that support friends offer to older persons' sense of self may enhance

affective states while with them. Also, older adullts engage in more recreational and less mundane activities with support friends, explaining the enhanced affective states when interacting with them (Larson et al., 1986).

Second, young and older adults are not similarly affected by interacting within their entire friendship network. The results did not support the hypothesis that similar to older adults, young adults contact with all friends would be more highly related to life satisfaction than contact with all family. Since the majority of college students' time is spent in contact with peers, the finding was unexpected; however, several factors may have contributed to this finding. One factor concerns the quality of the school friendships as compared to the quality of friends from one's hometown. It may well be that friends made at college are new and offer a kind of intimacy which cannot compare to the closeness of friends that have been known for a longer period of time. There is some evidence to support this idea that amount of contact is related to level of achieved intimacy, suggesting that new friends are probably not as "close" as old ones. Another factor concerns the fact that 60% of the young adult sample worked part-time thereby minimizing the opportunity for leisure time spent with friends. In fact, in comparison to the older adult sample's reported amount of interaction with friends (range of 7 - 596), the young sample reported much lower frequencies of contact with a range of 16 - 219. Perhaps, older adults had more quality time to interact with peers (Rosow, 1976; Larson,

1984), unobstructed by either minimized time nor by the fatigue of school work and employment.

Lastly, older and younger adults differ in the ways that their cognitive assessments mediate interaction outcomes. Cognitive assessments of others was hypothesized as the mechanism which accounts for positive evaluation of support relationships and thus affect interaction outcomes. This assessment of close friends were operationalized as a set of expectancies about close friends' behaviors which expressed the ways in which close friends were expected to act and the needs that close friends were expected to fill. For older adults who reported having support friends, friendship expectancies did mediate both a positive sense of life satisfaction and immediate affective states (Burgio, 1987a). This suggests that older people's cognitive assessment of close friends generate a positive attitude which mediates positive interaction with them. For young adults, the results were somewhat different, indicating that expectancies did not mediate positive life satisfaction but did mediate inmmediate affective states. This suggests that for life satisfaction of the young, the mere presence of support friends is more important to life satisfaction than the perceptions that these friends fulfill their needs. However, positive assessments of close friends' behaviors more strongly influence affective states than the presence of support friends in the networks of young adults.

Explaining why friendship expectancies may contribute more

to interpersonal affect than to life satisfaction among young adults would be purely speculative. Empirical studies that have used the idea of assessments as mediators of wellbeing generally have one measure of wellbeing, making explanations easier but simplistic. Be that as it may, one explanation might be that cognitive assessment of others are based more on the mood state of young adults. In other words, younger people may assess others positively only if they are in a positive mood. Older people's assessment of others may be less state-dependent and more based on their overall evaluations of the relationship in question, indicating a cognitive style with a broader perspective (Blanchard-Fields, 1986).

Conclusions

The present study attempted to address questions that may be very difficult to address, by its cross-sectional design and its lifespan focus. However, the results allow for some interesting speculations concerning the lifespan changes of social support in social networks. First, psychological wellbeing seems to be multidimensional through the lifespan. Thus, although support friends of young adults influence a sense of life satisfaction, these friends may not necessarily influence other dimensions of wellbeing, such as affective states. In addition, different dimensions of wellbeing may not be consistantly affected by given support relationships throughout the lifespan. For example, support friends may not influence affective states in young

adults but these same relationships may influence affective states in later years. Perhaps older persons have had more time to develop positive expectations that close friends, since they have had longer friendships.

Second, achieving wellbeing may be contingent upon receiving specific support which assists in dealing with the particular life stage tasks. Hence, if our culture prolongs the period of dependency in children who go to college, then security needs characterize the young adult years and parent support will be crucial to fulfill this need. In other words, support family relationships result in a sense of life satisfaction because security needs may be addressed by them. On the other hand, support relationships with friends may be the crucial relationship in later life because they offer a much needed confirmation of self and one's life, a shared perspective on life "as it is" and "as it will be", and hence can have a positive impact on mood tone- a dimension of wellbeing which has been related to health, mental health and mortality in the general population and in later life (Murphy, 1982; Cohen & McKay, 1982; Knapp, 1976).

Third, the life-span, developmental approach offers a broader explanation of the relative importance of friend and family support relationships. It suggests that friends may emerge in early life and re-emerge in later life because life events or developmental tasks require such relationships for psychological wellbeing (Larson, 1984). The developmental task

of intimacy which is central to young adult life (Erikson, 1968; Havighurst, 1972) may require contacts with opposite-sex peers who offer a testing ground for such social roles, a relationship which needs to be explored in further research.

Understandably, the "role-less" role of being old (Rosow, 1976) may profit from the benefical exchange between peers. Close friendships in later life have been found to be important relationships, but the present study indicates that expectations are better predictors of psychological wellbeing for older persons. In this population, psychological wellbeing seems to be more the ability to preceive close friends as fulfilling one's expectations than merely having such friends available in the network.

The present study is only a preliminary one and has several limitations as a result of methodological problems. The first concerns the comparability of New York City elderly and central New York college undergraduates when a life-span approach has been used. Since age changes were implied, every attempt was made to match the older and younger samples on race, socio-economic level and health; however, the comparability of urban and central New York populations is still questionable. Related to his is the possibility of that results were due differences between cohorts. Different cohorts may utilize friends and family for different purposes and with different results in wellbeing. According to Botwinick (1978), cohort effects are an unavoidable confound of cross-sectional comparisons and do not invalidate the

use of this methodology. Rather, cross-sectional ccomparisons serve as an initial, economically prudent, first step in developmental analyses. It is important, however, to remain aware that age-group differences may be attributable to either age or cohort effects.

Last, of methodological concern, is the unequal sample sizes of young (N=38) and older adults (N=142). It is possible that the results have been due to sampling error; a larger sample of young adults would have been more appropriate. As a result, the data cannot be accepted as strong evidence of the difference between young and old adults. For example, a larger sample of young adults may have resulted in more significant hierarchical regressions which first partials out the proportion of variance in the dependent variables due to expectancies, and then considers the variance contributed by numbers of support friends.

More importantly, the sample did not contain equal numbers of men (12) and women (26), producing a possible sex bias. Gender differences have been identified in both the young adult (Hays, 1985) and older adult (Booth & Hess, 1974) literature on social interaction, social support and wellbeing. For example, older women report having more intimate relationships than men (Booth and Hess, 1974), and numerous studies indicate that due to differences inn socialization both social perceptions and interaction styles may differ in young adult men and women (Gilligan, 1982; Jenks, 1981).

Table 1

Demographics of the Older Adults (N = 142)

Marital Status	N	Religious Affiliation	N
30% Widowed	44	8% Protestant	11
11% Divorced	15	54% Catholic	77
14% Never Married	20	36% Jewish	51
44% Married	63	2% Other	3

Age*		N	Sex	N
45%	65-70	53	49% Male	68
33%	71-74	39	51% Female	74
16%	76-79	39		
6%	80-85	11		

*Note: Mean age = 72.1, SD= 5.1

Table 2

Demographics of the Young Sample (N = 38)

Age*	N	%	Religion	N	%	M/F	N
17-18	21	55%	Protestant	4	11%	32% Male	12
19-20	12	32%	Catholic	19	50%	68% Female	26
21-23	5	14%	Jewish	1	3%		
			None	7	18%		
			Other	6	16%		

*Note: Mean age = 18.9

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of the Main Variables for Older Sample (N = 142)

Variable	N	Range	Mean	SD
Support Friends	142	0- 4	.4	.7
Support Kin	142	0- 13	1.1	1.7
Friend Contact	142	7-596	76.69	78.04
Kin Contact	139	8-240	68.66	46.89
Friendship Expectancies	142	43-175	103.14	25.49
Interpersonal Affect	142	28-140	83.73	9.79
Standard Life Satisfaction	142	1-9	5.15	2.05

Table 4

Pearson product-moment intercorrelation matrix of main variables

(N = 147)

	St Life	Affect	Expect.	Close Support People	Close Support Friends	Close Support Kin	Contact with Friends	Contact with Kin
St Life	1.00							
Affect	.17*	1.00						
Expectancies	.12	.38***	1.00					
Sup/People	.13	19**	.03	1.00				
Sup/Friend	.08	.20**	.16	.48	1.00			
Sup/Kin	.12	.14	-.03	.93	.11	1.00		
Contact								
w/friends	.12	.07	-.00	.15	.28***	.05	1.00	
w/kin[a]	.07	.17*	.05	.29***	-.07	.36***	-.06	1.00

*p<.05 **p<.02 ***p<.01 [a]N = 139

Table 5

Summary of two hierarchical regression analyses of the relation of close support friends to interpersonal affect and the relation of close support kin to interpersonal affect (N = 142)

Variable	Simple r	R^2	R^2 change	df	z
Demographics		.0287		4,137	
Support Friends	.20*	.0637	.0350	5,136	
Support Kin	.14	.0418	.0131	5,136	8.76**

* $p<.02$

** $p<.05$, two-tailed significance level

Table 6

Summary of two hierarchical regression analyses of the relation of close support friends to life satisfaction and the relation of close support kin to life satisfaction (N = 142)

Variable	Simple r	R^2	R^2 change	df	z
Demographics		.0631		4,137	
Support Friends	.08	.0662	.0031	5,136	
Support Kin	.12	.0667	.0036	5,136	.06

Table 7

Summary of two hierarchical regression analyses of the relation of friend contact to life satisfaction and the relation of kin contact to life satisfaction (N = 142)

Variable	Simple r	R^2	R^2 change	F	df	z
Demographics		.0631		2.31	4,137	
Friend Contact	.12	.0780	.0149	2.30*	5,136	
Kin Contact[a]	.07	.0642	.0011	1.82	5,136	9.2**

[a] N = 139

* p<.05

** p<.05, two-tailed significance level

Table 8

Summary of hierarchical regresion analysis of the relation of friendship expectancies and support friends to life satisfaction (N = 142)

Variable	r	R^2	F^1	df	R^2 change	F^2	df
Demographics		.0631	2.30	4,137			
Expectancies	.12	.0811	2.40*	5,136	.0180		
Support Friends	.08	.0922	2.02	6,135	.0011	.15	1,135

* p<.05

1 Tests of significance for R-squared

2 Tests of Significance for R-squared change

Table 9

Summary of hierarchical regression analysis of the relation of friendship expectancies and support friends to interpersonal affect (N = 142)

Variable	r	R^2	F^1	df	R^2 change	F^2	df
Demographics		.0287	1.01	4,137			
Expectancies	.38**	.1805	5.99**	5,136	.1518		
Support Friends	.20*	1955	5.47**	6,135	.0150	2.106	1,135

* $p<.02$

** $p<.01$

[1] Tests of Significance for R-squared

[2] Tests of Significance for R-squared change

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations of the Main Variables (N = 38)

Variable	Range	Mean	SD
Support Friends	0 - 5	1.47	1.11
Support Kin	0 - 3	.55	.92
Friend Contact	16- 219	66.71	37.70
Kin Contact	19- 201	46.31	31.76
Friendship Expectancies	95- 168	128.45	17.76
Interpersonal Affect	76- 106	91.97	6.62
Standard Life Satisfaction	2- 9	5.45	1.74

Table 11

Pearson-product moment intercorrelation matrix of main variables (N = 38)

	St.Life	Affect	Expect.	Support Friends	Support Kin	Contact Fnd	Contact Kin
St. Life	1.00	.26	.08	.35**	.42***	.01	.23
Affect		1.00	.32*	-.14	.17	-.11	.10
Expectancies			1.00	.26	.29	.13	.02
Sup/Friends				1.00	.42***	.34*	.06
Sup/Kin					1.00	.23	.37**
Contact w/Friends						1.00	.56***
w/Kin							1.00

* p< .05 *** p< .009
** p< .03 **** p< .0002

Table 12

Summary of two regression analyses of the relation of close support friends to life satisfaction and the relation of close suport kin to life satisfaction (N = 31)

Variable	Simple r	R	F	df	R change	z
support friends	.35**	.1229	5.04**	1,36		
support kin	.42***	.1731	7.54***	1,36	.1503	1.50

* p< .05

**p< .03

***p< .009

Table 13

Summary of two regression analyses of the relation of close support friends to interpersonal affect and the relation of close support kin to interpersonal affect (N = 38)

Variable	Simple r	R	F	df	R Change	z
Support Friends	-.14	.0201	.74	1,36		
Support Kin	.18	.0307	1.14	1,36	.0106	1.86

Table 14

Summary of two regression analyses of the relation of friend contact to life satisfaction and the relation of kin contact to life satisfaction (N = 38)

Variable	Simple r	R	F	df	R Change	z
Friend Contact	.01	.0001	.005	1,36		
Kin Contact	.23	.0537	2.04	1,36	.0536	16.75*

*p< .0001

Table 15

Summary of hierarchical regression analysis of the relation of friendship expectancies and close support friends to life satisfaction (N = 38)

Variable	Simple r	R	F	df	R change	F	df
Friend Expect.	.08	.0063	.23	1,36			
Support Friends	.35**	.1230	2.45	2,35	.1167	4.67*	1,35

* p< .05

**p< .03

Table 16

Summary of hierarchical regression analysis of the relation of friendship expectancies and close support friends to interpersonal affect (N = 38)

Variable	Simple r	R	F	df	R change	F	df
Friend Expect.	.32*	.1031	4.14*	1,36			
Support Friends	-.14	.1569	3.27*	2,35	.0538	2.24	1,35

*p< .05

References

Antonucci, T. & Depner, C.E. (1982). Social support and informal helping relationships. In T. Ashby Wills (ed.), Basic Processes in Helping Relationships, New York:Academic Press.

Arling, G. (1976). The elderly widow and her family, neighbors, and friends. Journal of Marriage & Family, 38, 757-768.

Arnstein, (1980). The student, the family, the university and transition to adulthood. In S. C. Feinstein et al (Eds.), Adolescent Psychiatry vol. 8(pp 160-172. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Asch, S. (1943). Forming impressions of personality. Journal of Abnorm. soc. Psychol., 41, 258-290.

Beckman, L.J. (1981). Effects of social interaction and children's relative inputs on older women's wellbeing. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 4 (16), 1075-1086.

Beigel, D.E., Shore, B.K. & Gordon,E. (1984). Building support networks for the elderly: Theory and applications, Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.

Blanchard-Fields, F. (1986). Reasoning on social dilemmas varying in emotional saliency: An adult development perspective. Psychology and Aging, 1(4), 325-333.

Booth, A. & Hess, B. (1974). Cross-sex friendships. Journal of Marriage & FAmily, 36, 38-47.

Botwinick,, J. (1978). Aging and Behavior (2nd Ed). New York:Springer.

Buhler, C. (1968). The course of human life as a psychological problem. Human Development, 11, 184-200.

Burgio, M. (1987). Friendship patterns and friendship expectancies among the successfully aging. (Doctoral Dissertation, New York University). University Microfilms, No. 8720109.

Burgio, M. (1987a) The role of social cognition in support friendships for the aging. Baltimore, MD:John Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 282 120).

Cantor, M. (1980). The informal support system:Its relevance in the lives of the elderly. In E. Borgotta & N. McClusky

(Eds.), Aging and society:Current research, California: Sage Publications, 131-144.

Caplan, G. (1974). Support systems and commmunity mental health, New York: Behavioral Publications.

Cobb,S. (1976). Social support as moderator of life stress. Psychosomatic Medicine, 38, 300-314.

Cohen, S. & McKay, G. (1984). Social support, stress and the buffering hypothesis: A theoretical analysis. In A. Baum, J.E. Sinser & S.E. Taylor (Eds.),Handbook of psychology and health Vol 4(pp 253-267), Hillsdale, N.J.:Erlbaum.

Cohen,S. & Antonucci, T. (1987).

Depner, C.E. & Ingersoll,B. (1981). Employment status and social support:The experience of the mature woman. In M. Sinovacz (Ed.), Women's retirement:Policy implications of recent research vol 6, New York: Sage Publications.

Dickens, W.J. & Perlman, D. (1981). Friendship over the life cycle. In S. Duck & R. Gilmour (Eds.), Personal relationships 2: Developing personal relationships, New York: Academic Press, 91-122.

Erikson, E. (1980). Identity and the Life Cycle. New York: N.W. Norton.

Erikson, E. (1978). Reflections on Dr. Borg's Life Cycle. In E.H. Erikson (Ed.), Adulthood, New York:W.W. Norton, 1-32.

Erikson, E. (1968). Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: W.W. Norton.

George, L. (1978). The impact of personality and social status factors upon levels of activity and psychological wellbeing. Journal of Gerontology, 33(6), 840-847.

Gilligan, C. (1982). New maps of development:New visions of maturity. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52, 199-213.

Hammer, M. (1981). Social support, social networks and schizophrenia. Schizophrenia Bulletin, 7(1), 45-57.

Hammer, M., Gutwirth, L. & Phillips, S. (1982). Parenthood and social network: A preliminary view. Unpublished report.

Havighurst, R. (1972).The social competence of middle-aged people. Genetic Psychology Monograph, 56, 297-375.

Hays, J.A.(1985).Aging and family resources:Availability and

proximity of kin. Gerontologist, 24(2), 149-153.

Hess, B. (1972). Friendship. Aging and Society, 3, 357-393.

Hess, B. (1979). Sex roles, friendship and the life course. Research on Aging, 1(4), 494-515.

Jenks, J.A. (1981). Adolescent to women: The quest for integration of affiliation and achievement. Master's thesis. Smith College School of Social Work.

Jessor, R. & Jessor, S.L. (1973). The percieved enviroment in behavioral science. American Behavioral Scientist, 16(6), 801-828.

Jones, E.E. (1966). Some of the determinants of interpersonal evaluating behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3(4), 397-403.

Kelley, G.A. (1955). The psychology of personal construct. New York: Norton.

Kelley, G.A. (1970). A brief introduction to personal construct theory. In D. Bannister (Ed.), Perspectives in personal construct theory, New York: Academic Press.

Knapp, M.L., Ellis, D.G., & Williams, B.A. (1980). Perceptions of communication behavior associated with relationships terms. Communication Monograghs, 47(4), 262-278.

Larson, R. (1984). States of consciousness in personal relationships: A life span perspective. Paper presented at the Int'l Conference on Personal Relationships, Madison, Wisconsin, July 22-27.

Larson, R., Mannell, R. & Zusunek, J. (1986). Daily wellbeing of older adult with friends and family. Psychology and Aging. 1(2), 117-126.

Murphy, E. (1982). Social origins of depression in old age. British Journal of Psychiatry, 41, 135-142.

Neugarten, B. (1969). Continuities and discontinuities of psychological issues in adult life. Human Development, 12, 121-130.

Neugarten, B. (1966). Adult personality: A developmental view. Human Development, 9, 61-73.

Offer, D. & Offer, J.B. (1975). From Teenage to Young Manhood:A Psychological Study. New York:Basic Books.

Reis, H. (1984). Social interaction and well-being. In S. Duck (Ed.), Personal relationships V: Repairing personal relationships, London: Sage Publications.

Rosow, I. (1967). Social integration of the aged. New York: Free Press.

Rosow, I. (1976). Status and role change through the life span. In R. Binstock & E. Shanas (Eds.), Handbook of aging and the social sciences. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Tamir, L. (1982). Communication and the aging process. New York: Pergamon Publications.

Ward R.A., Sherman, S.R. & Lagory, M. (1984). Subjective network assessments and subjective wellbeing. Journal of Gerontology, 39(1), 93-101.